

benefiting from the service of grant recipients.

The Government Service Fellowship feature of the IPA have been used very little by State and local governments, primarily because it is a financial burden which State and local governments are unable or unwilling to absorb. The Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Personnel Policy, in its January 1973 report to the President and the Congress, recommended that the Federal portion of the funding for salary costs of Government Service Fellowships be increased to 75 percent. The Advisory Council also noted that "at no time, however, should the Federal Government assume the full cost of the program."

Next, the proposed amendments provide for several technical changes in the intergovernmental mobility provisions of the IPA. These amendments will provide greater flexibility to Federal, State and local agencies and help to assure fairness and equity for mobility assignees.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act (5 U.S.C. 3371-3376) does not exempt Federal employees from Federal conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. 203 and 205) while they are on mobility assignments. This has been a problem in some cases. At issue is the possible conflict of interest in cases where the Federal employee would act on behalf of a State or local government in representations before a Federal agency. Currently, conflict of interest statutes prohibit an employee from acting as an agent or attorney or in a representational capacity on behalf of a State or local government or an institution of higher education before any Federal agency.

We believe a conflict of interest does exist if the Federal assignee represents a State or local government in matters pending before his employing agency. However, we believe a conflict of interest does not exist if the Federal assignee represents the State or local government in matters pending before an agency other than his employing agency. We have proposed an amendment to the IPA which would allow a Federal mobility assignee to act on behalf of the organization to which assigned on matters pending before any Federal agency, other than his own agency or an agency in which he was employed during the preceding year.

To prohibit the temporary assignment of a Federal employee to a position involving representational duties would be an unfortunate and unnecessary limitation on the intergovernmental mobility program. It is in such a position that the Federal employee can probably make the greatest contributions in terms of improved public services and better intergovernmental cooperation. In addition, a mobility assignment to such a position would be an invaluable experience to the Federal employee, his employing agency, and the State or local jurisdiction. It would provide knowledge and insights into the complexities of intergovernmental relations which cannot be duplicated in any other setting.

We have also recommended amendment of 5 U.S.C. 3374(b) to prevent the potential loss of Federal employee benefits (e.g., retirement, health insurance, etc.) in the rare case where such benefits apply to non-Federal employment, by certain employees (Cooperative Extension Service employees in the States and employees of the District of Columbia) while they are on mobility assignments to Federal positions. Under current law these benefits would be lost, since Federal benefits do not apply to employees on mobility assignment, under temporary appointment to Federal agencies.

We have proposed a change in 5 U.S.C. 3374(C)(1) to permit agencies to supplement the pay of some State and local government employees assigned to Federal positions, to bring this pay in line with Federal compensation for work of equal responsi-

bility. State and local employees may be assigned to Federal agencies on a leave without pay basis (LWOP) or on detail from their jurisdiction. In some jurisdictions; LWOP jeopardizes tenure and other employee rights, and only the detail process is feasible. Detailed employees continue to receive their salaries, however, directly from their jurisdiction. These salaries are usually different from the salaries received by assignees on LWOP, who receive Federal appointments and are paid according to Federal pay schedules. This proposed change would permit State and local employees doing work of equal responsibility on mobility assignments to be paid the same, irrespective of employment practices in their jurisdiction.

We are also proposing an amendment to permit Federal agencies to reimburse State and local governments for costs of fringe benefits (e.g., health and life insurance, retirement, etc.) of employees on temporary details to Federal agencies. Executive agencies are authorized to pay such costs for State and local employees receiving temporary appointments to Federal positions, but not for State and local employees on detail. This restriction has reduced a mobility assignment's attractiveness to a State or local government or institution of higher education. It has been the deciding factor in whether or not a State or local government or university will permit an employee to accept a mobility assignment.

An additional amendment would permit the payment of miscellaneous expenses related to a geographic move for the purpose of a mobility assignment. These payments would be in line with expenses now paid by the Federal government in connection with permanent changes in duty stations. It would not extend reimbursement for real estate fees. The incidental expenses, now provided in regulations on permanent changes of station, cover such costs as automobile registrations, drivers' licenses, and similar miscellaneous expenses. An employee who accepts an extended temporary assignment which involves obtaining a place of residence incurs these expenses. In fairness, he or she should be able to claim them.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act does not provide for participation in any way by Indian tribes and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Full coverage under the IPA is recommended to provide comparable benefits that are now available only to State and local governments, and territories and possessions of the United States. By comparable benefits, we mean the opportunity for these governments to fully participate in IPA grants, technical assistance, training and intergovernmental mobility. Such participation would enable these jurisdictions to improve their personnel resources and strengthen their systems of personnel administration.

IPA grants could be used by Indian tribes and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to establish or improve personnel management systems, and to train and develop employees to better plan and manage their own programs. As increasing amounts of Federal "no-strings" resources are provided to Indian tribes, effective and modern management by Indian tribes becomes even more important. Because of their special needs, Indian tribes would be excepted from the population requirements for IPA grants, and from State review of grant applications.

Through use of the intergovernmental mobility provisions of the IPA, Indian tribes and the Trust Territory would be able to capitalize on the talents of experienced Federal employees through temporary assignments of personnel between Federal agencies and such jurisdictions. The expertise of Federal employees could be applied directly to a wide variety of problem areas (e.g., health, welfare, housing, law enforcement, economic development, etc.). Similarly, Federal agencies which serve these entities

would be able to obtain the temporary services of Indian tribe and Trust Territory employees to improve the delivery and effectiveness of Federal assistance.

Finally, we propose amendment of the IPA to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands in the allocation of formula grant funds (80 percent of grant appropriations). Section 506(b)(5) of the IPA defines "State" for the purpose of allocating formula grant funds as "the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia." As a result, awards to the territories and possessions of the United States in FY 1972 (about \$300,000) and FY 1973 (about \$330,000) came from the allocation of discretionary grant funds (20 percent of the grants appropriations). The net effect has been to limit the opportunity to fund additional worthy State and local government projects. In addition, if grants are to be made to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Indian tribes as we have proposed, we will need to provide some funds for these governments from the allocation of discretionary grant funds.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I insert a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 16075

Paragraph 1 of section 1 continues for three more years, to July 1, 1978, the Commission's authority to make grants to State and local governments and other organizations for up to 75 percent of the costs of programs and projects to strengthen personnel administration in State and local governments and to train and develop State and local government employees. Under the current law, the Federal share of such costs will be reduced to 50 percent by July 1, 1975.

Paragraph 2 of section 1 raises the limit on reimbursements to State and local governments for Government Service Fellowships from one-fourth (25%) to 75 percent of the salary of a recipient of a Government Service Fellowship, and establishes an obligated service requirement for recipients.

Paragraph 3 of section 1 defines the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the governing bodies of Indian tribes which perform substantial governmental functions as jurisdictions which are eligible to participate in all of the IPA programs, and exempts Indian tribes from population and other requirements imposed on local governments.

Paragraph 4 of section 1 includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands in the allocation of formula grant funds (80% of appropriated grant funds), and excludes a specific appropriation for Government Service Fellowships from the allocation requests of section 506.

Paragraph 1 of section 2 defines the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the governing bodies of Indian tribes, as eligible jurisdictions for the purpose of participating in intergovernmental mobility assignments.

Paragraph 2 of section 2 permits a Federal employee on a mobility assignment to act as the attorney or agent for a State or local government or institution of higher education in representations before another Federal agency, except his employing agency or an agency with which he was employed during the year prior to his assignment. Currently, conflict of interest statutes prohibit this.

Paragraph 3 of section 2 provides technical amendments to assure fairness and equity for persons participating in mobility assignments. If enacted, Federal retirement and other benefits, in the rare case where such programs apply to certain State and D.C. Government employees, would not be lost by such employees while they are on mobility assignments. Federal agencies would also be permitted to supplement the pay of State or local employees on detail to Federal

agencies to assure comparability of pay with other State or local employees doing work of equal responsibility. Federal agencies would be authorized to reimburse State and local governments and institutions of higher education for various fringe benefit costs (e.g., health and life insurance, retirement, etc.) of employees on detail from such organizations.

Paragraph 4 of section 2 authorizes an executive agency to reimburse mobility assignees for certain miscellaneous travel expenses (e.g., automobile registrations, drivers' licenses, etc.).

Section 3 provides an effective date for these amendments of not later than 90 days after enactment or an earlier date after enactment if the Commission so decides.

#### STEELMAN AMENDMENT ON FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I plan to seek a rule which would allow me to offer a floor amendment to the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974, which will soon be reported by the House Administration Committee. My amendment which is similar to title IV of S. 3044, the election campaign bill passed by the Senate, would require the full disclosure of personal finances.

Mr. Speaker, to require the disclosure of campaign contributions without requiring personal financial disclosure is giving to a concerned public, at a time in history when a severe crisis exists in their confidence with public officials, only half the story when the whole truth is needed.

My amendment would apply equally to all elected Federal officials, to candidates for nomination for or election to Federal office, to everyone in the legislative or judicial branches who is compensated by the U.S. Government at an annual rate of \$32,000 or above, to those persons who perform duties of a kind generally assigned to an individual holding grade GS-16 or higher in the general schedule, and to all generals and admirals in the military. As Senator HOWARD CANNON, the author of the Senate amendment, has said:

If the principle of disclosure is to be honored it should be observed by all officers and employees in policymaking positions in every branch, department or agency of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would require that each individual disclose the source of each item of income or reimbursement; and of any gift received by him, by him and his spouse jointly, by his spouse or by his dependents from outside the immediate family having a value in excess of \$100; together with fees and honorariums for speeches, articles or attendance at conventions or other assemblies. In addition, the individual would be required to disclose the value of assets and liabilities held either in his own name, or by him and his spouse jointly, by his spouse or by his dependents.

All dealings in securities, commodities or real property whether made by the individual or by the individual and his spouse jointly or by any person acting

on his behalf would also have to be reported.

All reports would be filed with the Comptroller General of the United States and would be public documents. The first report required would be due 30 days after the enactment of the bill.

The GAO has estimated the costs of this type of operation to be \$2.75 per person required to file. Since approximately 15,000 individuals would be required to submit reports, the total cost of my amendment would be only about \$41,250.

Mr. Speaker, the public disclosure of income from sources other than one's Government salary or of transactions in stocks, bonds, or other securities is almost non-existent. The executive branch has a Presidential executive order which is more of an administrative directive than a disclosure measure. No laws now require the President and Vice President to disclose their finances. The Federal courts subscribe to canons of ethics but do not require any reporting of financial or business activities. In the Congress, each body has a code of ethics but these codes call for public reporting only with respect to contributions, gifts, or honorariums. Reports of outside income, activities, and holdings are filed on a confidential basis and are not open to the public.

Voluntarily I have made it a practice to fully disclose my own finances and income tax return. At least 104 of my colleagues now in the House and 37 Senators have at some point in the last 10 years made some kind of public statement about their personal finances. Voluntary disclosure, however, is not a satisfactory resolution of the problem since each statement can be made as the individual chooses and no standards apply.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in this "post-Watergate" era complete and public disclosure by all officials in policymaking positions in all branches is needed to help dispel the prevalent suspicion and cynicism of the workings of the Government. Senator JOHN TOWER has even gone beyond my proposal and has said:

In this day of distrust for public office holders, I think it is imperative that Members of Congress—as well as the President—open their tax returns for public inspection.

Many Members of Congress—men of unquestionable integrity—hold strong opinions against making public their personal financial affairs. They argue that full public disclosure would amount to a deprivation of the privacy that ordinary citizens enjoy with respect to their holdings. In fact, it is for this reason that I have not included a copy of an individual's income tax return in my amendment; although I personally feel that public officials should also be required to disclose their income tax returns.

But Mr. Speaker, public officials have chosen to take on public duties and responsibilities which transcend their private interests and which must necessarily place them under public scrutiny. Representatives, Senators, Judges, high-level Federal officials, or employees make

or administer laws that affect business; they write or administer the taxes that corporations as well as individuals must pay. Since they must regularly deal with questions that affect every segment of the economy in varying ways, as Senator CHURCH has said:

There is every legitimate reason for making their private holdings a matter of public record.

Mr. Speaker, financial disclosure is needed not so much because of the wrongdoing it may expose or prevent, but because of the doubts it will lay to rest. The vast majority of public officials abide by the laws they make and administer. One of the primary purposes of financial disclosure is to convince the public that it can trust its elected representatives. As Senator ADLAI STEVENSON III has pointed out:

Trust must be earned with facts; it cannot be elicited with empty words.

Disclosure is also the best means of policing avoidable conflicts of interest because it allows constituents to make an informed judgement about a public official's performance of his public duties in the face of a possible conflict. In addition, full public disclosure will encourage public officials to judge their own conduct with greater care. It will also provide the overwhelming majority of Government officials the strong ground of truth to stand on against unfair charges and innuendo.

Mr. Speaker, the current clamor for full financial disclosure was only intensified by Watergate. In fact, the movement for personal disclosure has been gaining momentum since the late 1940's. Former Senator WAYNE MORSE introduced a bill on the subject in 1946. In 1952 former Senator Paul Douglas wrote in his book, "Ethics in Government":

The good name of the vast majority of public servants has been besmirched by the misbehavior of a relatively small minority. . . . the public has come to believe that the revealed sins of the few are the predominate practices of the many. In the long run perhaps this is the worst consequence of the evil acts which have come to light. The men who have committed unethical acts have not only disgraced themselves; they have disgraced the federal service and they have seriously weakened the faith which people have in their government. When faith is thus weakened, the power of our democracy to survive . . . is also dangerously impaired.

Public knowledge of incomes of public officials should have a reassuring effect. In the white light of the facts, false suspicions and mistrust will diminish.

On March 14, 1964, a Gallup Poll published in the Washington Post asked if the American people would approve requiring Congressmen to make public disclosure of their financial holdings and income every year. The results were: 65 percent in favor; 23 percent opposed; 12 percent no opinion.

Mr. Speaker, many State legislatures have already adopted full financial disclosure laws similar to my amendment and these laws have been upheld by the courts. In the case of *Stein v. Howlett*, 289 N.E. 2d 409; cert. denied 412 U.S. 925 (1973), the Supreme Court of Illinois upheld that State's financial disclosure law,

requiring the detailed disclosure of all income, assets, and investments over designated amounts, against the constitutional challenge of overbreadth and unwarranted State intrusion upon the right of privacy. This case was cited with approval by the Supreme Court of Washington in the case of *Fritz v. Gordon*, 517 P. 2d 911 (1974), which upheld the financial disclosure law of the State of Washington against similar constitutional challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that other, separate, bills are pending on this subject—and, as I have pointed out, bills have been pending on this subject since 1946. That is just the point, there is little likelihood of action on these other bills—as the past has proven. Therefore, I am offering my amendment to the House Administration Committee's election campaign bill as an opportunity to finally allow the House to vote yea or nay on personal financial disclosure.

Moreover, as Senator Tower has said, legislation dealing with personal financial disclosure "is an important and essential part of any campaign reform. It, in my opinion, would do much to improve the attitude of the American people toward their elected representatives."

In Senator STEVENSON's words:

The legacy of Watergate can be either lingering public cynicism and governmental drift, or more open and effective self-government. I believe we have the will and the vision to make the right choice, and that the enactment of financial disclosure legislation is an important part of that choice.

The text of my amendment follows:

Page 40, immediately after line 20, insert the following new title:

**TITLE III—DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS BY CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES**

**FEDERAL EMPLOYEE FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS**

SEC. 301. (a) Any candidate for nomination for or election to Federal office who, at the time he becomes a candidate, does not occupy any such office, shall file within one month after he becomes a candidate for such office, and each Member of Congress, each officer or employee of the judicial branch or legislative branch of the Federal Government who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$32,000 per annum, any individual occupying the position of an officer or employee of the United States who performs duties of the type generally performed by an individual occupying grade GS-16 of the General Schedule or any higher grade or position (as determined by the Board of Supervisory Officers regardless of the rate of compensation of such individual), any member of a uniformed service who is compensated in an amount equal to or in excess of the amount of pay for pay grade 0-7 or any higher grade of pay established under chapter 3 of title 37, United States Code, the President, and the Vice President shall file annually, with the Board, a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount of each tax paid by the individual, by the individual and the individual's spouse filing jointly, or by the individual's spouse filing separately for the preceding calendar year;

(2) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from his spouse or any member of his immediate family) received by him, by him and his spouse jointly, by his spouse,

or by his dependents, during the preceding calendar year which exceeds \$100 in amount or value, including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by him in kind;

(3) the identity of each asset held by him, by him and his spouse jointly, by his spouse, or by his dependents, which has a value in excess of \$1,000, and the amount of each liability owed by him or by him and his spouse jointly, together with the amount of each liability which is owed with respect to any financial interest which is under his constructive control, which is in excess of \$1,000 as of the close of the preceding calendar year;

(4) any transactions in securities of any business entity by him or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year if the aggregate amount involved in transactions in the securities of such business entity exceeds \$1,000 during such year;

(5) all transactions in commodities by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year if the aggregate amount involved in such transactions exceeds \$1,000; and

(6) any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding calendar year if the value of property involved in such purchase or sale exceeds \$1,000.

(b) Reports required by this section (other than reports so required by candidates for nomination for or election to Federal office) shall be filed not later than May 15 of each year. A person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than three months after such last day, as the Board may prescribe.

(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Board may prescribe. The Board may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, when separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealing in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

(d) Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this section or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined not more than \$2,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Board as public records, which, under such reasonable rules as it shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual is considered to be President, Vice President, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of the United States, or a member of a uniformed service, during any calendar year if he serves in any such position for more than six months during such calendar year.

(g) The first report required under this section shall be due thirty days after the date of the enactment of this section and shall be filed with the Comptroller General

of the United States, who shall, for purposes of this subsection, have the powers and duties conferred upon the Board by this section.

(h) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "income" means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(2) the term "tax" means any Federal, State, or local income tax and any Federal, State, or local property tax;

(3) the term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b);

(4) the term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2);

(5) the term "transactions in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, or other disposition involving any security or commodity;

(6) the term "Member of Congress" means a Senator, a Representative, a Resident Commissioner, or a Delegate;

(7) the term "officer" has the same meaning as in section 2104 of title 5, United States Code;

(8) the term "employee" has the same meaning as in section 2105 of such title;

(9) the term "uniformed service" means any of the Armed Forces, the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, or the commissioned corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(10) the term "immediate family" means the child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of an individual, and the spouses of such persons;

(11) the term "candidate" has the meaning given it by section 301(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(b));

(12) the term "Federal office" has the meaning given it by section 301(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(c)); and

(13) the term "Board" means the Board of Supervisory Officers established by section 308(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

And redesignate the following title and sections accordingly.

Page 55, line 16, insert "(1)" immediately after "(b)".

Page 55, immediately after line 18, add the following new paragraph:

(2) The provisions of title III of this Act shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**NOVEMBER 11 IS VETERANS DAY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing legislation to return the annual observance of Veteran's Day to November 11. Each year this Nation pauses to pay tribute to those who have laid down their civilian pursuits and taken up arms in defense of the United States.

Each generation has been tested in the crucible of combat. Each has had to pay a terrible price in blood and anguish to preserve the blessings of freedom we all enjoy. Each is due the undying gratitude of every American.

Following the Great War of our fathers, Armistice Day was established on November 11 to commemorate the date on which the war to end all wars was concluded. Millions fell in that conflict, and millions more returned home bearing the scars of war. It was altogether

fitting and appropriate that their sacrifices should be remembered by their fellow citizens each year. Armistice Day was a day of reflection, a day for those who survived to honor those who did not.

Our generation learned that our fathers had not been successful in the effort to end all wars. In fact, we learned that the seeds of World War II were sown in the peace of the first war.

We too laid down our civilian lives and went to farflung battlefields to defend democracy. The cemeteries of Europe and the islands of the Pacific were destined to be the final resting places for our generation's citizen soldiers.

When we returned from distant theaters of war we joined ranks with our fathers on November 11 each year to honor those whose sacrifices had kept this Nation free.

Since then, we have been joined by veterans tempered in the frozen mountains of Korea and the steaming jungles of Vietnam. Each generation has joined in a single purpose. We honor those who served, we honor those who died, we honor those who have learned that freedom is never free.

Now, however, Veterans Day is just another 3-day holiday. America no longer pauses on the anniversary of the armistice to reflect and honor her veterans.

One hundred and eleven years ago at the dedication of the military cemetery at Gettysburg, President Lincoln spoke of the debt that we owe to those who have served. His thoughts are worth remembering today:

But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us. That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth.

I urge the House to reinstate November 11 of each year as Memorial Day, to remember and honor our veterans of all wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### DEMOCRACY IN THE CRADLE OF DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the resignation today of the dictator of Greece

in order to permit transfer of government to civilian control restores democracy to the cradle of democracy for the first time in 7 years.

As one who has long lamented the absence of individual liberty in the land of Socrates and the reluctance of the administration to bring pressure upon Athens for a restoration of constitutional government, I find this development an occasion for great joy.

While the transition will not be without problems, I have never doubted the capacity of the Greek people to find and maintain that delicate balance between liberty and license without which democracy cannot survive.

Today's events vindicate the steadfast devotion—and suffering—of thousands of Greek patriots who never bowed to the dictator's threats and kept alive the spirit of democracy even when martial law ruled every street corner of Athens and the jails teemed with political prisoners.

The transition in Athens is cause for thanksgiving and rejoicing wherever liberty flourishes, and especially in the Atlantic community. It removes a cancer dangerous to the entire NATO community. For the first time since the Atlantic Treaty was signed the people rule in each of the 15 nations of NATO. May it always be thus.

#### CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1974 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit by unanimous consent as official business the results of a poll which I conducted recently to obtain the opinions of citizens residing in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am privileged to represent, on issues of national significance under consideration by the Congress of the United States.

More than 21,000 questionnaires were completed and returned, and I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all those who responded. I am pleased by the size of the response, which has increased each year, and particularly by the extensive comments added by so many of my constituents.

Although polls provide helpful indications of citizen concerns, no public official can be guided by the results of polls alone. An elected official's highest obligation is to his oath of office and to the constitutional order, and sometimes therefore, he must vote his own conscience despite an aroused public feeling or a sudden turn in public attitude.

Many of my constituents emphasized this obligation by telling me in their comments that they were glad to express their opinions but at the same time wanted me to make the final judgment on what was best for our Nation and its people.

This questionnaire, therefore, has provided the means for an exchange of views—between citizen and legislator—which is so valuable to me and is so vital

to the fabric of our democracy. Fifteen broad questions were asked relating to both domestic and foreign policy issues, and the responses on the questionnaires were tabulated entirely by computer. Before listing a numerical summary of the tabulation, I want to point out some significant reactions to several important issues.

On four major issues, 11th District residents were almost evenly divided—impeachment, campaign financing, inflation, and NATO troop strength. On these questions, no clear consensus of opinion emerged.

On the impeachment issues, 45 percent wanted to remove the President from office either through resignation or impeachment, and 45 percent wanted him to remain in office, with 10 percent undecided.

On the campaign financing issue, 44 percent wanted Presidential campaigns financed with tax revenues, while 44 percent did not, and 12 percent were undecided. On congressional campaigns, 41 percent favored financing with tax revenues, while 45 percent did not, and 14 percent were undecided.

On the inflation issue, 38 percent favored wage, price, and profit controls, while 37 percent favored the law of supply and demand, and 25 percent were either undecided or wanted gradual decontrol.

On NATO troop strength in Europe, 40 percent wanted to maintain our present troop strength, 43 percent wanted to reduce it, while 17 percent were undecided.

The House Judiciary Committee in the next few weeks is expected to make a recommendation to the House of Representatives on the issue of impeachment. In the meantime, the House Administration Committee, on which I serve, has completed work on a campaign reform measure which I supported and which provides for public financing of Presidential elections and Presidential primaries through a tax checkoff voluntary method. The new measure is designed to strengthen the Federal Campaign Reform Act of 1971, which I also supported and which requires that campaign contributions be reported and made public. However, the 1974 bill is far superior to the 1971 law because it not only provides for full disclosure but places limitations on contributions.

Over and over again, in comments on the questionnaires, citizens expressed their grave concern, which I share, over runaway inflation that is lowering the living standard of all Americans. One major reason for our current unstable economic condition is the increase in our money supply caused by the Federal Reserve Board, an independent agency run without Congressional oversight. The Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, recently moved to serve notice by having passed in the House a bill providing an audit of the Federal Reserve Board by the General Accounting Office. It is our hope that this will be a warning to the Federal Reserve Board that Congress is closely monitoring interest rates, for there is no other single